United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/31/NGA/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
24 August 2018

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-first session
5-16 November 2018

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Nigeria*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 36 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review. A separate section is provided for a contribution by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. The National Human Rights Commission did not make a submission.

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[2]

3. JS9 stated that the Federal Republic of Nigeria ("Nigeria") had not acceded to the Second Optional Protocol to International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty;3 and ERI stated that Nigeria had not ratified Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its Optional Protocol.[4]

4. ICAN stated that Nigeria had signed the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons on 20 September 2017, but had not ratified the Treaty.[5]

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

GE.18-13971(E)
1813971

Please recycle

B. National human rights framework[6]

5. JS12 stated that while Chapter II of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria detailed economic and social rights as Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy, those rights were not justiciable.[7]

6. JS9 stated that the legislative framework had not incorporated all of the provisions from the international and regional human rights treaties that had been ratified by Nigeria.[8]

7. WRAHP stated that Nigeria had ratified Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women in 1985 but was yet to fulfil its obligations arising from the Convention.[9] JS10 stated that the incorporation of the provisions of the Convention into the national legislative framework through the enactment of the Gender and Equal Opportunities Bill had made little progress.[10]

8. JS3 stated that the Hate Speech bill that had been introduced before the Senate was vaguely-worded, provided no clear definition of hate speech and was open to abuse. Furthermore, the Bill had infringed the relevant rights provided for in the Constitution.[11]

9. JS9 stated that the Human Rights Commission had remained toothless and had lacked the power to render binding decisions or to compel legal action or cooperation. It had little financial support and autonomy. The Commission's members included government representatives, compromising its independence.[12]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[13]

10. JS8 stated that discrimination had remained institutionalised in families and communities, and was evident in the behaviours of government officials, such as the police, health workers and educators.[14] Nigeria had continued to allow the violation of the rights of the LGBT population, despite its obligations to protect those rights arising from several international human rights conventions to which it was a party.[15]

11. JS5 recalled that Nigeria had not supported any of the recommendations from the previous review that inter alia related to the repealing of those laws that discriminated based on sexual orientation and gender identity.[16] Certain provisions in the Criminal Code, Penal Code and the National Law and Drug Enforcement Act had disproportionately affected gay men, female sex workers, and intravenous drug users. The Same Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Act had negative consequences beyond the deprivation of marriage rights for gay men and women.[17] JS5 stated that, under Sharia law the penalty for homosexuality was death.[18] The Violence against Persons (Prohibition) Act of 2015, had done little to protect gay men, female sex workers and intravenous drug users as vulnerable populations.[19] AFA stated that the Act was yet to be incorporated into domestic legislation in all states. [20]

12. JS8 stated that expansive provisions of the Same Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Act had served to codify homophobia and transphobia.[21] JS12 stated that the Act, which generally criminalized same sex relationships, had created additional criminal offences that targeted persons based on their sexual orientation.[22] JS8 stated that the Act had effectively legalized discrimination and had allowed people to act with impunity. Since its enactment there had been an increase in crimes and human rights violations against LGBT persons and their defenders.[23] JS13 stated that the Act and other discriminatory laws had been used to subject the LGBT community to violations including invasion of privacy, assault and battery, black mail and extortion, denial of access to amenities and education.[24]

13. Referring to a relevant study, JS12 noted a significant increase in fear in seeking healthcare services by men who had sex with men after the enactment of the Same Sex Marriage (Prohibition) Act (2014).[25] JS13 stated that sections 5(2) and (3) of the Act had hindered access to Anti-Retroviral Vaccines, HIV testing and counselling services.[26] JS8

stated that LGBT persons had experienced difficulties in accessing health care services. The denial of such services would have a negative impact on Nigeria's progress towards HIV eradication.[27]

14. While noting the enactment of HIV/AIDS (Anti-discrimination) Act, 2014, which aimed to protect the rights and dignity of all persons living with and affected by HIV, JS12 stated that discrimination against and violation of the rights of people living with HIV had persisted.[28]

15. JS5 stated that gay men, female sex workers and intravenous drug users had experienced significant discrimination, influenced by traditional culture as well as religious moral values.[29]

16. TLM stated that persons affected by leprosy and their families had continued to face discrimination on the account of the stigma because of the deformities arising from late detection. Prevailing myths and superstition had led to the erroneous perception that the disease was highly infectious leading to exclusion and discriminatory practices against persons affected by leprosy and their families.[30]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights[31]

17. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, AI stated that the National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency Act (Amendment) Bill, 2017, if enacted into law, would empower the Agency to efficiently record and report oil spills independently of the oil companies and to sanction oil companies.[32]

18. JS14 stated that decades of oil exploitation in the Niger Delta have resulted in severe environmental degradation in Ogoniland.[33] The clean-up project launched in June 2017 was yet to commence, as the funds had not been provided.[34] As a result of the pollution, various health conditions had been detected among members of the Ogoni community, but no information was provided to the community on the impact of the pollution on their health.[35]

Human rights and counter-terrorism[36]

19. AI stated that The Terrorism (Prevention) Act (as amended) was overly broad and violated Nigeria's Constitution and its international human rights obligations. The Constitution requires suspects to be brought before a court within 48 hours of them being detained, whereas the Act provides for extended periods of detention of individuals suspected of involvement in terrorism.[37]

20. LEPAD stated that security operatives had committed grave human rights violations in their response to the Boko Haram insurgency. Innocent citizens had been arrested, tortured and unlawfully detained.[38]

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[39]

21. AI stated that since 2014, Boko Haram had committed war crimes and crimes against humanity, killing at least 9000 civilians, abducting thousands of women and girls and destroying villages and towns.[40]

22. JS10 stated that security agencies, particularly the police and the military, had been implicated in widespread human rights violations including excessive use of force, extrajudicial killings, torture, arbitrary arrests and detention, enforced disappearances and extortion.[41]

23. IHRC stated that during the period of 12 to 14 December 2015, the armed forces attached unarmed civilians resulting in the death of at least 1000 people. The Judicial Commission of Inquiry set up by the state government in Kaduana to look into those killings lacked independence and impartiality.[42]

24. SRW stated that in November 2015, the army had attached Shia processions in Kaduna state killing over 400 men, women and children.[43]

25. While noting that Nigeria was the first African country to ratify the Arms Trade Treaty, JS16 stated that the proliferation of small arms and light weapons had been very high.[44]

26. AI stated that the death penalty remained mandatory in criminal law for a wide range of crimes with some states expanding the range of crimes to include kidnappings.[45] JS18 stated that as soon as a crimes assumes notoriety or begins to overwhelm law enforcement agencies, the response has been to impose the death penalty for such crimes.[46]

27. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review, AI stated that the authorities were yet to amend Force Order 237 which provided for a much wider scope for the use of lethal force than is permissible under international law and standards and was often used to justify shooting by police officers.[47]

28. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, AI stated that in December 2017, the President of Nigeria signed the Anti-Torture Act, which penalized acts of torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment.[48] PRAWA stated that this law had significant gaps for example, in relation to investigations and victims right to reparation and rehabilitation.[49]

29. PRAWA stated that there had been consistent allegations of torture by members of the Special Anti-Robbery Squad to extort confessions from detainees and arrested persons and conditions in most places of detention constitute at the very least cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. Unfortunately, those allegations had not been effectively investigated, alleged perpetrators had not been prosecuted, and victims had no access to reparation and rehabilitation.[50]

30. PRAWA stated that the National Committee on Prevention of Torture had been established to monitor the treatment of persons deprived of their liberty. However, this Committee had been unable to fully execute its mandate pursuant to OP-CAT due to a wide variety of problems, including inadequate resources; the lack of a central database or register of all places of detention, their location, and number of detainees; and the lack of effective access to all places of detention.[51]

31. Referring to supported recommendations from the previous review relating to extremism and violence by extremist groups, JS3 stated that attacks on non-Muslim communities in central Nigeria by the Fulani militia had spiralled following the inauguration of President Buhari in May 2015.[52] Although Nigeria had supported a recommendation to prevent acts of violence against religious minorities, sectarian intolerance and violence against religious minorities had increased and perpetrators had rarely been apprehended or punished.[53]

32. HRF stated that in 2016, the military arrested thousands of men, women, and children, including those who were fleeing from Boko Haram in Borno state, based on random profiling rather than on reasonable suspicion of having committed a recognizable crime.[54]

33. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, AI stated that despite efforts by the government, through the army-led Special Board of Inquiry and the Presidential Investigative Panel, to review compliance by the armed forces with human rights, the authorities were yet to hold any member of the armed forces accountable for gross human rights violations.[55]

34. JS3 stated that kidnapping for ransom had risen. There had been a spike in kidnappings on the Kaduna-Abuja road, despite a large security deployment.[56] Furthermore, of the 276 female students who had been abducted from the Government Secondary school in Chibok in 2014, 113 girls had been unaccounted for.[57] In February 2018, 110 girls had been abducted from the Government Girls Science and Technical College in Dapchi, Yobe State, 105 of who had since been returned. Five girls had reportedly died.[58]

35. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, AI stated that although conditions in detention have improved, inmates had continued to die.[59] JS10 stated that there had been overcrowding and understaffing in prisons, as well as a lack of medical care, and inadequate conditions for female and juvenile prisoners. [60] AI stated

that in the north east of Nigeria, the military had detained thousands of people between 2014 and 2017, without access to courts and with some people detained for up to two years.[61]

36. JS12 expressed concern about the practice of incarcerating caregivers with infants.[62]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[63]

37. FLD expressed serious concerns about the impartiality and independence of the criminal justice system. It stated that wealthy individuals, the police, the security forces and government agencies had repeatedly used the criminal justice system to target those who exposed corruption.[64] HRF stated that corruption had contributed to the miscarriage of justice as judicial personnel had been known to solicit bribes in order to deliver favourable rulings.[65]

38. LEPAD stated that human rights cases had been subjected to unnecessarily long adjournments for reasons, which included the limited number of judges in some of the courts.[66]

39. JS4 stated that legal system had comprised of Islamic Law, English Common Law and Customary Law. With each body of law prescribing its own definitions of relevant offences and penalties, this had made the protection of children challenging.[67] Furthermore, the lack of a uniform definition of a child had adversely affected the protection of victims and the prosecution of alleged offenders.[68]

40. Referring to relevant supported recommendations, LEPAD stated that the practice of not ensuring the appearances of arrested and detained suspects before a competent court within the prescribed time, had persisted, despite the Administration of Criminal Justice Act, 2015.[69]

41. PRAWA stated that arrest and detention had appeared to be the standard response to any crime regardless of its severity, and had often happened before any meaningful investigation had been undertaken. Detained suspects had faced significant challenges which hindered them being brought before a judge within a reasonable time. Furthermore, the frequent use of the sentence of imprisonment for petty crimes, such as street hawking, following summary trials by mobile courts had resulted in a high number of persons, including minors, serving terms of imprisonment.[70]

42. JS18 stated that the police had lacked the capacity to undertake effective criminal investigations. There were no forensic laboratories, equipment or facilities to link crimes to suspects. Most charges for crimes attracting the death penalty had been based on confessional statements and the Judiciary had been complicit when it convicted persons on the evidence of those statements and sentenced them to death, knowing the limitations of the criminal justice system.[71]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[72]

43. JS4 stated that about 50 percent of the population were Muslim, 40 were Christian and the remaining 10 percent held indigenous beliefs.[73] JS15 stated that conversion from one religion to another was not always possible and that there was no freedom to choose one's religion.[74]

44. JS3 stated that religious minorities in the northern and central states had not enjoyed the freedoms of thought, conscience and religion particularly since the adoption of the Shari'a penal code by twelve states.[75] In those states, non-Muslims had been denied the rights, opportunities and protections that had been enjoyed by Muslims.[76]

45. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review, JS3 stated that in most Shari'a states, construction of churches had been restricted.[77]

46. JS15 stated that barriers to the exercise of the freedom of worship had been social and political rather than legal and had been connected to the competition for resources and power.[78]

47. JS3 stated that although Nigeria supported a recommendation from the previous review to protect children from forced conversion, such a practice had continued,

particularly in Shari'a states, where non-Muslim girls had experienced abduction, forced conversion and forced marriage. Local Islamic institutions through the enforcement of traditional rules had often been complicit in those violations.[79]

48. JS11 stated that on 23 August 2017, the Director of Defence Information had announced the military's plan to monitor social media activities from strategic media centres to sieve out and react to speeches that conveyed "anti-government", "anti-military" or "anti-security" sentiments.[80] Those developments had contributed to an atmosphere of fear of surveillance.[81]

49. JS2 stated that Nigeria had not effectively implement eight supported recommendations from the previous review relating inter alia to the protection of human rights defenders, journalists and civil society representatives.[82]

50. Referring to two supported recommendations from the previous review, which inter alia related to human rights defenders, FLD stated that over the past five years the working environment for human rights defenders had deteriorated.[83] They had been targeted by the authorities, as well as armed groups.[84]

51. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review, JS16 stated that, despite several efforts, the legislation for gender equality in political participation had not been followed-up by any effort for implementation.[85]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[86]

52. JS4 stated that Nigeria had been a source, transit and destination country for trafficking of children for sexual exploitation.[87] Discussions had been ongoing among government ministries on the formulation of a new national action plan.[88] Furthermore, the respective police task forces that had been established at federal and state levels to tackle human trafficking was not been working efficiently. In some states, the police task force had not been established.[89]

53. JS15 stated that children who were no longer with their parents were particularly at risk of being forced into slavery and hard labour in home and on farms, and into prostitution. Also, girls were at risk of being trafficked to other parts of the country to work as "house-helps".[90]

Right to privacy and family life[91]

54. JS11 stated that the Terrorism (Prevention) Act, 2011, and the Cybercrimes (Prohibition, Prevention, Etc) Act 2015 contained insufficient protections to ensure the right to privacy, as they did not comply with the internationally recognised principles with which surveillance policies and practices should be compliance, such as legality, necessity, proportionality, judicial authorisation, effective independent oversight, transparency, and user notification.[92] Two privacy-related bills, the Data Protection Bill 2015 and the Digital Rights and Freedom Bill 2016, were expected to become law in 2018. Although the Data Protection Bill set forth relevant safe guards, important aspects remained untouched.[93]

55. JS11 stated the draft Lawful Interception of Communications Regulation had raised concerns. If brought into force, this regulation would enable interception of communications—both with and without a warrant—and require mobile phone companies to retain intercepted voice and data communications for three years. It would also require telecommunications licensees to provide specified security agencies with access to protected communications virtually on demand.[94]

56. While noting that in 2012 the High Court inter alia recognized the unlawfulness of HIV testing without informed consent, JS12 stated that the practice of non-consensual HIV testing had persisted.[95]

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

57. JS2 stated that Nigeria had implemented a supported recommendation from the previous review, which called for the amendment of the Trade Union (Amendment) Act (2005) and the recognition of collective bargaining.[96]

58. ICTUR stated that the Trade Unions Act created institutional barriers to the establishment, operation and maintenance of trade unions.[97]

59. ICTUR stated that, pursuant to the Trade Dispute Act, any worker who participates in a strike in connection with a trade dispute where the Minister has ordered conciliation or arbitration is guilty of an offence.[98]

60. ERI stated that it was a common practice to hire employees without advertising positions, requesting written applications or inviting applicants to interviews.[99]

Right to social security

61. JS15 stated that many children lived below the poverty level, with inadequate clothing, food, shelter, education or access to healthcare.[100]

Right to an adequate standard of living[101]

62. Referring to supported recommendations on improving access to adequate and affordable housing from the previous review, JS13 stated that Nigeria had not implemented those recommendations.[102] Although the relevant policies had been introduced, they had not been comprehensively implemented. Furthermore, the funding schemes had been inaccessible to the under-privileged and the poor.[103]

63. AI stated that thousands of people had continued to be at risk of forced evictions across the country with very few laws and safeguards in place to stipulate the process for lawful evictions. Between 2015 and 2017, about 40 000 poor urban dwellers were forcibly evicted in Lagos State. In some instances, the authorities had ignored court orders declaring the evictions unlawful.[104]

64. JS10 stated that there had been an increase in demolitions and forceful evictions of families from their properties without compensation and alternative accommodation.[105] JS13 stated that LGBT persons had been subjected to forced, violent and arbitrary evictions.[106]

65. JS4 stated that Nigeria was a leading economic power in Africa, due, in particular, to high oil revenues. However, due to a poor distribution of wealth, rampant corruption and, an atmosphere of insecurity and violence, 54 percent of the population lived below the international poverty line of US$1.90 per day.[107]

66. JS17 stated that the significant reduction in the federal budget for water and sanitation would have a dramatic effect on the realization of access to water and sanitation.[108]

Right to health[109]

67. JS1 stated that maternal health remained underfunded. Since the Abuja Declaration in 2001, Nigeria had not attained the pledged funding benchmark of 15 percent of the annual budget.[110]

68. JS16 stated that there was a lack of access to adequate healthcare, family planning services, counselling and education for rural women.[111] ADF stated that Nigeria must focus on helping women to get through pregnancy and childbirth safely. Women should be provided with access to knowledge-based education about their bodies, healthy behaviours and responsible decision-making.[112]

69. JS1 stated that the maternal mortality rate had remained high. Accessibility and availability of quality maternal health care had been impeded by the cost of services, the distance to health facilities, and the inadequate and long waiting times at public health

facilities.[113] JS10 stated that maternal health had become a major challenge for "community women" in the Niger Delta, who had depended on traditional birth attendants for maternity services.[114] WRAHP stated that untrained traditional birth attendants were responsible for over 35 percent of the deliveries, which contributed to the high rates of maternal mortality.[115]

70. JS1 stated that women and girls in conflict zones had continued to face numerous reproductive rights violations, including child and forced marriage, sexual and gender based violence, unsafe abortions and lack of access to family planning information and services.[116]

71. JS1 stated that access to safe legal abortion and post-abortion care had remained lacking. Abortion laws had remained restrictive and had resulted in clandestine and unsafe abortions.[117] Low contraceptive usage had been a leading and contributing factor to the high rates of unwanted and unplanned pregnancies.[118]

Right to education[119]

72. WRAHP stated that there had been a decline in the standard of education.[120] JS3 stated that at the previous review, Nigeria had supported a number of recommendations in relation to the right to education.[121] However, Nigeria would struggle to implement those recommendations, particularly those relating to the provision of free access to primary education.[122]

73. JS16 stated that the education system was severely underfunded resulting in a lack of proper infrastructure, inadequate classrooms and teaching aids. There were examination malpractices, cultism, sexual abuse, bribery, corruption and hooliganism.[123]

74. S3 stated that there had been a lack of government funding for schools in predominantly non-Muslim areas, and informal schools created with the help of non-governmental organisations had experienced difficulties with their registration.[124] JS16 stated that Nigeria had not given any attention to the education of girls in remote parts of the country.[125]

75. JS8 stated that homophobic bullying in schools had proven to be a serious impairment to adequate access to education. There had also been a failure to provide comprehensive and inclusive education on sexual orientation and gender identity in schools.[126]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[127]

76. JS15 stated that Nigeria had failed to address traditional practices that had hampered gender equality. Discrimination started even before the birth of a girl. Education of boys had been prioritised over that of girls and girls were denied the right to inherit property.[128]

77. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, JS1 stated that in 2015, the laws on gender-based violence had been consolidated into the Violence against Persons (Prohibition) Act, 2015, which broadly covers physical, psychological, economic, and sexual violence, including rape, as well as harmful traditional practices.[129] However, the Act was only in force in the federal capital and that several states did not have specific laws prohibiting sexual and gender based violence. Moreover, Section 55 of the Penal Code, which was in force in the North, specifically allowed husbands to discipline their wives.[130]

78. WRAHP stated that domestic violence and gender-based violence had been on an increase and that the relevant authorities had not given adequate attention to the issue.[131] JS16 stated that domestic violence remained underreported for reasons that included the existence of a culture of silence and the turning away of victims at police stations on the grounds that such a matter was a family affair.[132]

79. JS13 referred to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review and stated that although there had been enactment of progressive laws, harmful gender norms,

cultural practices and discriminatory laws had persisted.[133] In several communities, women had been barred from owning immovable property or from renting a house.[134]

80. PRAWA stated that female genital mutilation was a common practice in many states in Nigeria. Such a practice was an abuse of the rights of victims to reproductive health and in severe cases could lead to their death. The Violence against Persons (Prohibition) Act (2015) recognizes female genital mutilation as an offence.[135] However, according to PJ, the legislation had not been effectively implemented.[136] JS10 stated that there had been a low rate of prosecution for alleged acts of female genital mutilation.[137]

81. JS10 stated that women, girls and children had been most affected by the insurgency in the northeast part of Nigeria. Women and girls had been used as suicide bombers, and had been exposed to sexual abuse, drug trafficking and prostitution within the camps for internally displaced people.[138]

82. JS16 stated that a precondition for achieving lasting peace and security was to build the potential of rural women and girls, who constituted 81 percent of the farmers.[139] It further stated that the lack of consistent funding and the sustainability of programmes has continued to prevent any significant improvement for rural women.[140]

83. CITAD expressed concern by the persistent threats, harassments, intimidations and attacks on women internet users. It expressed alarm by the failure of the government to protect women from gender-based violence on line.[141]

Children[142]

84. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, JS4 stated of the 36 states, only 25 had enacted the Child Rights Act, 2003, which had been enacted at the federal level to integrate the provisions of Convention on the Rights of the Child into the national legislative framework.[143]

85. Referring to a relevant supported recommendation from the previous review, JS4 stated that the Department of Child Development, which was the main body for protecting children rights, and the National Agency for the Prohibition of Trafficking in Persons had lacked human and financial resources.[144]

86. JS4 stated that in 2016, a national campaign to end all forms of violence against children by 2030 had been launched, in line with Target 16.2 of the Sustainable Development Goals.[145]

87. GIEACPC called for the enactment of laws explicitly prohibiting corporal punishment in all settings, including in the home, as a sentence for a crime and in traditional and religious law. It also called for the repeal all defences and authorizations for the use of corporal punishment.[146]

88. JS12 expressed concern about the high rates of child marriage and the need to address the underlying factors that contributed to early marriage.[147] JS16 stated that state legislation on the minimum age of marriage varied from state to state.[148]

89. PJ stated that in the Niger Delta there had been a huge challenge to implement legislation prohibiting child labour.[149]

Persons with disabilities[150]

90. Referring to relevant supported recommendations from the previous review, JS16 stated that the Disability Rights Bill, which was passed by 6th and 7th National Assemblies, was yet to be signed into law by the President.[151]

91. JS15 stated that people with disabilities had experienced discrimination and had no access to any special education or social welfare. Institutions such as schools, hospitals, churches, airports and government offices were not disability-friendly. Millions of people with disabilities lived below the poverty level and were deprived of basic needs such as adequate clothing, food and shelter, education and access to health care.[152]

Minorities and indigenous peoples[153]

92. JS3 stated that members of the Igbo ethnic group were vulnerable. On 6 June 2017, men who had purported to represent 19 northern Muslim youth groups had held a press conference to release a document entitled the 'Kaduna Declaration' that denigrated Igbos, and had given them a deadline to leave the 19 northern states or face 'visible actions'. The Kaduna State Governor el Rufai had issued an order for the immediate arrest of those men. However, they remain at large.[154] Furthermore, in August 2017, a song that had referred to Igbos as a curse to Nigeria and had advocated violence against them had been widely circulated.[155]

93. JS9 stated that the Nigeria's response to the protracted violent conflict between the Nomadic Fulani Herders and the Indigenous Peoples of Numan Federation had shown a lack of political will and capacity to end the conflict, address the root causes and to restore mutual peace and coexistence between the different ethnic groups and communities in the region.[156]

94. MUTUK stated since the previous review, there had been recurrent and unprovoked attacks on the Tiv communities in Benue state by Fulani nomadic herdsman. The Federal Government had failed to take reasonable and appropriate measures to protect those communities.[157]

95. JS14 stated that the Ogoni language was no longer included in the school curriculum. Representatives of the Ogani community had advocated for a multilingual education programme in schools that included teaching children in their mother tongue.[158]

Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[159]

96. JS15 stated that 1.9 million people had been displaced due to years of insurgency and counterinsurgency operations. Those people have had inadequate accommodation, no farmland or access to food or means of earning a living. They have relied solely on food deliveries from local churches and sometimes from the International Community of the Red Cross.[160]

97. PJ stated that in the camp for internally displaced persons, women and girls had been exposed to sexual abuse, drug trafficking, and prostitution, coupled with challenges arising from inadequate health and sanitary facilities, food and adequate security.[161]

Notes

[1] *Civil society*
Individual submissions:

ADF	ADF International, Geneva, Switzerland;
AFA	Alliance for Africa, Nigeria;
AI	Amnesty International, London, United Kingdom;
CITAD	Center for Information Technology and Development, Melville, South Africa;
ERI	Edmund Rice International, Geneva, Switzerland;
FLD	Front Line Defenders, Dublin, Ireland;
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London, UK;
HRF	Human Rights Foundation, New York, USA;
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Geneva, Switzerland;
ICTUR	The International Centre for Trade Union Rights, London, UK;
IHRC	Islamic Human Rights Commission, Wembley, UK;
LEPAD	Legal Defence and Assistance Project, Lagos, Nigeria;
MUTUK	The Mutual Union of the Tiv in United Kingdom, London, UK;
PRAWA	Prisoners' Rehabilitation and Welfare Action, Copenhagen, Denmark;
PJ	Partnership for Justice, Lagos, Nigeria;
SRW	Shia Rights Watch, Washington D.C., USA;

TLM	The Leprosy Mission International, London, UK;
WRAPH	Women's Rights and Health Project, Lagos, Nigeria.
Joint submissions:	
JS1	Centre for Reproductive Rights, Legal Defence and Assistance Project, and Women Advocates Research and Documentation Centre, New York, United States of America (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Johannesburg, South Africa, and Nigeria Network of NGOs, Nigeria (Joint Submission 2);
JS3	Christian Solidarity Worldwide, New Malden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and CSW-Nigeria (Joint Submission 3);
JS4	Women Consortium of Nigeria, Lagos, Nigeria, and ECPAT International, Bangkok, Thailand (Joint Submission 4);
JS5	Heartland Alliance International, Chicago, United States of America, American University, Washington College of Law, International Human Rights Law Clinic, United States of America (Joint Submission 5);
JS6	International Service for Human Rights, Geneva, Switzerland, Partnership for Justice, Legal Defence and Assistance Project and Women's Rights and Health Project (Joint Submission 6);
JS7	Jubilee Campaign, Fairfax, United States of America, Advocates International, and the Institute on Religion and Democracy (Joint Submission 7);
JS8	The Equality Hub, Leitner Center for International Law and Justice, New York, United States of America, One Action Foundation, OutRight Action International, and ReSista Camp (Joint Submission 8);
JS9	The Lutheran World Federation, Geneva, Switzerland; The Lutheran Church of Christ in Nigeria, Adamawa State, Nigeria; and the United Adamawa Forum /Global Peace and Reconciliation Initiative (Joint Submission 9);
JS10	The Coalition of Nigerian Human Rights CSOs on UPR comprising of: Partnership for Justice, Lagos, Nigeria; Sterling law Centre, Abuja, Nigeria; Centre for Citizens Rights, Abuja, Nigeria; CLEEN Foundation Lagos, Nigeria; Women Africa, Abuja, Nigeria; Lux Terra Leadership Foundation, Abuja, Nigeria; West African Human Rights Defenders' Network, Lome, Nigeria; Rural Integrated Dev. Initiative, Bauchi, Jalnyo, Taraba State, Nigeria; Women's Rights and Health Project, Lagos, Nigeria; Kebetkache Women Dev. & Resource Centre, Portharcourt, Nigeria; African Centre for Leadership, Strategy & Development, Abuja; Centre LSD, South South, Nigeria; Centre for Sustainable Development, Yobe State, Nigeria; Youths for Peace and Development, Bauchi, Nigeria; Beautiful Eves of Africa Organisation, Eungu, Nigeria; Partners West Africa-Nigeria, Abuja, Nigeria; Nigerian Women Trust Fund, Abuja, Nigeria; FIDA, Abuja, Nigeria; PEDANET, Edo State, Nigeria; AFRICMIL, Abuja; NCICC, Abuja, Nigeria; Education as a Vaccine, Abuja, Nigeria; Community Centre for Development, Sokoto, Nigeria; Conference of Rights Nigeria, PLAC, Abuja, Nigeria; CASER, Abuja, Nigeria; EVA, Abuja; Alliances for Africa, Owerri, Nigeria; Development Dynamics, Owerri, Nigeria; Michael Adedotun Oke Foundation, Abuja, Nigeria; Network on Police Reform in Nigeria, Lagos, Nigeria; Foundation For Environmental Rights Advocacy & Development, Eungu, Nigeria; Partnership to Inspire, Transform and Connect the HIV Response Abuja, Nigeria; Parent Child Intervention Centre, Eungu, Nigeria; JCI Hope Project, Eungu, Nigeria; Agents of Communication and Development, Eungu, Nigeria;

	African Women and Children Care Support Initiative, Eungu; International Centre for Development and Budget Advocacy, Eungu; Universal Career Discovery and Development Initiative, Eungu; Bold And Beautiful Girls Initiative, Womenaid Collective, Eungu; Prisoners Rehabilitation and Welfare Action, Eungu, Nigeria; FIDA, Eungu, Nigeria; AFRILAW, Abuja, Nigeria; Centre for Citizens with Disabilities, Lagos, Nigeria; WARDC, Lagos, Nigeria; REPLACE, Abuja, Nigeria; and LEDAP, Lagos, Nigeria (Joint Submission 10);
JS11	Paradigm Initiative; and Privacy International, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Joint Submission 11);
JS12	Lawyers Alert, Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria; and Southern Africa Litigation Centre, Johannesburg, South Africa (Joint Submission 12);
JS13	Women Action for Gender Equality, Kano, Nigeria; Coalition of African Lesbians, Braamfontein, Johannesburg; and Sexual Rights Initiative, Ottawa, Canada (Joint Submission 13);
JS14	Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization, Bruxelles, Belgium; and Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People, Port Harcourt, Nigeria (Joint Submission 14);
JS15	The World Council of Churches, the Christian Council of Nigeria (CCN), the CCN Institute of Church and Society Ibadan, the CCN Institute of Church and Society Jos, Methodist Church Nigeria, Ecumenical Disability Advocates Network, Divine Foundation for Disabled Persons, and the Finnish Ecumenical Council (Joint Submission 15);
JS16	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Geneva, Switzerland, presenting the submission on behalf of Arike Foundation, Dorothy Njemanze Foundation, Federation of Muslim Women Association of Nigeria, Initiative for Sustainable Peace, West Africa Network for Peacebuilding, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom – Nigeria, Women's Right Advancement and Protection Alternative, Women for Skill Acquisition Development and Leadership Organization (Joint Submission 16);
JS17	Friends of the African Union Global Solutions Center, Cincinnati, USA and West Pride of Nigeria, Lagos, Nigeria (Joint Submission 17);
JS18	The Human Rights Law Service, Legal Defence and Assistance Project, and The Coalition against the Death Penalty, Montreuil, France (Joint Submission 18).

[2] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/26/6, paras. 135.1-135.7, 135.10, 135.35, 135.44, 137.1-137.5, 137.23 and 137.25.

[3] JS9, para. 3. JS9 made a recommendation (p. 2).

[4] ERI, p. 3.

[5] ICAN, p. 1. ICAN made a recommendation (p. 1).

[6] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.8, 135.9, 135.11, 135.12, 135.14-135.20, 135.22, 135.23-135.25, 135.27, 135.28, 135.29, 135.30-135.33, 134.42, 135.43, 135.48, 135.50, 135.53, 135.54, 137.6, 137.7 and 137.74.

[7] JS12, para. 2.1, JS12 made a recommendation (p. 3).

[8] JS9, para. 4. JS9 made a recommendation (p. 2).

[9] WRAHP, p. 4.

[10] JS10, para. 2.1.1. JS10 made recommendations (para. 2.1.1); See also PJ, p. 3. PJ made recommendations (p. 3); AFA, p. 2. AFA made a recommendation (p. 2).

[11] JS3, paras. 83 and 84. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 86).

[12] JS9, para. 6. JS9 made recommendations (p. 3).

[13] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.5, 135.66, 135.67, 135.165, 138.1-138.4, 138.7, 138.9 and138.10.

[14] JS8, para. 35.

[15] *Ibid*, para. 4.

[16] JS5, para. 4, referring to referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 138. 1 (Austria), para. 138.2 (Czech Republic), para. 138.3 (United States of America); para. 138.4 (Sweden), para.138.5 (Canada), 138.6 (Australia); para. 138.8 (Austria) para. 138.9 (France) and para. 138.10 (Uruguay).
[17] *Ibid*, para. 15.
[18] *Ibid*, para. 17.
[19] *Ibid*, para. 21. JS5 made recommendations (p. 7).
[20] AFA, p. 2.
[21] JS8, para. 5.
[22] JS12, para. 3.19. JS12 made recommendations (p. 9).
[23] JS8, para. 6. See also JS6, p. 2. JS6 made recommendations (p.4).
[24] JS13, para. 34. See also JS6, p. 2. JS6 made recommendations (p.4).
[25] JS12, para. 3.21 and fn. 40.
[26] JS13, paras. 16 and 17. JS13 made recommendations (paras. 48 – 50).
[27] JS8, para. 24.
[28] JS12, paras. 3.5 and 3.6. JS12 made a recommendation (p. 7).
[29] JS5, para. 8.
[30] TLM, p. 1. TLM made recommendations (pp. 2-3).
[31] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.167-135.169 and 137.34.
[32] AI, p. 2 and fn. 9 referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.167 (Cuba), para. 135.168 (Maldives) and para. 135. 169 (Thailand).
[33] JS14, para. 10.
[34] *Ibid*, para. 21; See also AI, p. 5. AI made recommendations (p. 6).
[35] *Ibid*, paras. 26 and 29. JS14 made recommendations (p. 11).
[36] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.73, 135.75 -135.78, 135.81 and 135.170-135.172.
[37] AI, p. 3. AI made a recommendation (p. 6).
[38] LEPAD, p. 4. LEPAD made recommendations (p. 6).
[39] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.68-135.70, 135.72, 135.73, 135.75, 135.80, 135.82, 135.106-135.112, 137.10-137.13, 137.22, 137.24, 137.28-137.30.
[40] AI, p. 4. AI made recommendations (p. 7); See also JS10, para. 3.6.1. JS10 made a recommendation (para. 3.6.1).
[41] JS10, para. 3.5.1. JS10 made recommendations (para. 3.5.6).
[42] IHRC, pp. 4-5.
[43] SRW, para. 8. SRW made recommendations (p. 4).
[44] JS16, p. 8. JS16 made recommendations (p. 9).
[45] AI, p. 5. AI made recommendations (p. 7).
[46] JS18, p. 8.
[47] AI, p. 1 and footnote 4, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 137.7 (Spain). AI made a recommendation (p 6).
[48] *Ibid*, p. 1 and footnote 1, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.69 (Switzerland), para. 135.72 (Canada), para. 135.73 (Hungary), and para135.74 (Sweden); See also HRF, para. 11.
[49] PRAWA, para. 9. PRAWA made recommendations (para. 11).
[50] *Ibid*, para. 9. PRAWA made recommendations (para. 11); See also HRF, para. 12. HRF made recommendations (para. 18).
[51] *Ibid*, para. 10. PRAWA made recommendations (para. 11).
[52] JS3, paras. 10 and 11, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.122 (Canada) and para. 135.128 (Holy See); See also JS7, p. 7, para. 10.
[53] *Ibid*, para. 32, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.82 (Cape Verde). JS3 made recommendations (paras. 40-42); See also JS7, p. 4, para. 1.
[54] HRF, para. 15.
[55] AI, p. 1 and footnote 3 referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 136.69 (Switzerland), para. 135.70 (UK), para. 135.71 (USA), para. 135.72 (Canada), para. 135.75 (Czech Republic) and para. 135.79 (Ireland).
[56] JS3, para. 18. JS3 made recommendations (paras. 28-30).
[57] *Ibid*, para. 64. See also JS7, p. 3, para. 13.
[58] *Ibid*, paras. 65 and 66. See also JS4, para. 35; JS7, p. 4, para. 15.
[59] AI, p. 1 and fn. 5, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para.135.34 (Belgium), para. 135.106 (Germany), para. 135.108 (Czech Republic) and para. 135.109 (France), para. 135.122 (UK) and para. 135.118 (Belgium).
[60] JS10, para. 5.1.3. JS10 made recommendations (para. 5.1.3).
[61] AI, p. 1.
[62] JS12, para. 3.2. JS12 made a recommendation (p. 5).
[63] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.71, 135.79, 135.113, 135.114, 135.116-

135.121.

64 FLD, para. 15. FLD made recommendations (para. 27).
65 HRF, para. 14. HRF made a recommendation (para. 18 (c).
66 LEPAD, p. 6. LEPAD made recommendations (p. 6).
67 JS4, para. 5.
68 *Ibid*, para. 26. JS4 made recommendations, p. 8.
69 LEPAD, p. 3, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.117 (Austria), para. 135.118 (Belgium) and para. 135.119 (Switzerland).
70 PRAWA, para. 7. PRAWA made recommendations (para. 8); See also HRF, para. 14, HRF made a recommendation (para. 18 (b).
71 JS18, p. 9. JS18 made recommendations (p. 10).
72 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.122-135.128, 135.160 and 137.31.
73 JS4, para. 5.
74 JS15, p. 4, JS15 made recommendations (p. 5).
75 JS3, para. 3.
76 *Ibid*, para. 4. JS3 made recommendations (para. 6).
77 *Ibid*, para. 31 referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.66 (Argentina).
78 JS15, para. 6. JS15 made recommendations (p. 6).
79 JS3, para. 67, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.93 (Holy See); See also JS7, para. 14; JS15, p. 5.
80 JS11, para. 25. See also JS6, p. 2. JS6 made recommendations (p. 4).
81 *Ibid*, para. 26. JS11 made recommendations (para. 26).
82 JS2, para. 3.1 and Annex, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.69 (Switzerland), para. 135.70 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), para.135.71 (United States of America), para. 135.72, para. 135.75 (Czech Republic), (Canada), para. 135.159 (Tunisia), para. 135.160 (Djibouti) and para. 137.7 (Spain). See also A/HRC/25/2, para. 467 for Nigeria's position on the recommendations. JS2 made recommendations (paras. 6.2 and 6.6).
83 FLD, para. 4 and endnote 1, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.159 (Tunisia) and para. 135.160 (Djibouti).
84 *Ibid*, paras. 2 and 6. FLD made recommendations (para. 27); See also JS10, para. 9.1. JS10 made recommendations (para. 9.1.); JS6, p. 2. JS6 made recommendations (p. 4). PJ, p. 6. PJ made recommendations (p. 6).
85 JS16, pp. 6-7, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.57 (Malaysia). JS16 made recommendations (pp.7-8).
86 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.90 and 135.91.
87 JS4, para. 8.
88 *Ibid*, para. 15, JS4 made recommendations (p.4).
89 *Ibid*, para. 40.
90 JS15, pp. 3-4. JS15 made recommendations (p. 4).
91 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, para. 138.6.
92 JS11, para. 8. JS11 made recommendations (para. 45).
93 *Ibid*, para. 44. JS11 made recommendations (para. 45).
94 *Ibid*, paras. 19-21. JS11 made recommendations (para. 28).
95 JS12, para. 3.8, JS12 made a recommendation (p. 7).
96 JS2, para. 2.1, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 137.31 (United States of America). See also A/HRC/25/2, para. 467 for the position taken by Nigeria on the recommendation. JS2 made recommendations (para. 6.1).
97 ICTUR, p. 3.
98 *Ibid*, p. 4.
99 ERI, p. 4.
100 JS15, p. 11.
101 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.129, 135.130, 135.132-135.134.
102 JS13, para. 22, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.130 (Ecuador) and para. 135.132 (Malaysia); See also AI, p. 2.
103 JS13, para. 23. JS13 made recommendations (paras. 51 - 54).
104 AI, p. 2 and p. 5. AI made recommendations (p. 6).
105 JS10, para. 4.1.1.
106 JS13, para. 29.
107 JS4, para. 6.
108 JS17, p. 7.
109 For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, para.135.135-135.140 and 135.143.
110 JS1, para. 11.
111 JS16, para. 17.

[112] ADF, para. 14. ADF made a recommendation (para. 24).
[113] JS1, paras. 7 and 8. JS1 made recommendations (p. 7) See also JS15, p. 11. JS15 made recommendations (p. 11).
[114] JS10, para. 2.3.1. JS10 made recommendations (para. 2.3.1); See also P', p. 4. PJ made recommendations (p. 4).
[115] WRAHP, p. 4.
[116] JS1, paras. 2, 3 and 6). JS1 made recommendations (p. 7).
[117] *Ibid*, paras. 13 and 14. JS1 made recommendations (p. 7.).
[118] *Ibid*, paras. 16 and 17. JS1 made recommendations (p. 7).
[119] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.144-135.55 and 136.1-136.3.
[120] WRAHP, p. 5. WRAHP made recommendations (p. 5).
[121] See e.g. A/HRC25/6, para. 135.144 (China) and para. 136.1 (Indonesia).
[122] JS3, para. 56. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 60). See also JS15, pp. 11-12.
[123] JS16, p. 19. JS16 made recommendations (pp. 19-20).
[124] JS3, para. 57. JS3 made a recommendation (para. 61).
[125] JS16, p. 18. JS16 made recommendations (p. 18).
[126] JS8, para. 30.
[127] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.21, 135.45, 135.46, 135.55 - 135.65, 135.97, 135.100-135.102, 135.104, 135.105, 137.8, 137.16 and 137.27.
[128] JS15, p. 2. JS15 made recommendations (p. 15).
[129] JS1, para. 19 and endnote 80, referring to A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.94 (Canada), para. 135.97 (Maldives) and para. 135.98 (Philippines).
[130] *Ibid*, para. 19. JS1 made recommendations (p. 7); See also JS16, p. 9. JS16 made recommendations (p. 10); PRAWA, paras 12 and 13. PRAWA made recommendations (para. 14).
[131] WRAHP, p. 2. WRAHP made recommendations (p. 3).
[132] JS16, p. 10. JS16 made recommendations (p. 11); See also PJ, p. 5. PJ made recommendations (p. 5).
[133] JS13, paras. 4-6, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.21 (Ireland), para. 135.62 (Algeria), 135.63 (Angola) and para. 135.64 (Benin). JS13 made recommendations (paras. 44-47).
[134] JS13, para. 28.
[135] PRAWA, para. 15.
[136] PJ, p. 3. PJ made a recommendation (p. 3).
[137] JS10, para. 2.2.1. JS10 made a recommendation (para. 2.2.1).
[138] *Ibid*, para. 3.1.1. JS10 made recommendations (para. 3.1.1).
[139] JS16, p. 14.
[140] *Ibid*, p. 16. J16 made recommendations (p. 16).
[141] CITAD, pp. 1-2. CITAD made recommendations (pp. 5-6).
[142] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.13, 135.26, 135.49, 135.52, 135.83-138.89, 135.92-135.95, 135.161 and 135.163.
[143] JS4, paras 23 and 24, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.83 (Montenegro), 135.86 (Poland) and para. 135.115 (Belgium); See also JS13, para. 13, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.94 (Canada).
[144] JS4, para. 18, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.52 (Sudan). JS4 made recommendations (p. 5).
[145] *Ibid*, para. 32.
[146] GIEACPC, p. 2.
[147] JS12, para. 3.4. JS12 made a recommendation (p. 5).
[148] JS16, pp. 13-14. JS16 made recommendations (p. 13).
[149] PJ, p. 4.
[150] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.156-135.159 and 135.162.
[151] JS16, p. 20, referring to A/HRC/25/6, para. 135.61 (Cambodia), para. 135.147 (Slovakia) and para. 135.156 (Egypt). JS16 made recommendations (p. 21).
[152] JS15, p. 12 JS15 made recommendations (p. 12).
[153] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.164 and 137.33.
[154] JS3, para. 51.
[155] *Ibid*, para. 52.
[156] JS9, paras. 7, 11 and 12. JS9 made recommendations (p. 6); See also JS16, para. 22.
[157] MUTUK, pp. 1-3. MUTUK made recommendations (p. 6).
[158] JS14, para 46. JS14 made recommendations (p. 11).
[159] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/6, paras. 135.166 and 137.32.
[160] JS15, p. 13.
[161] PJ, p. 4. PJ made recommendations (p. 59).